

November 28, 2001

CONGRATULATIONS TO SIX ALUMNI RECIPIENTS OF 2001 GEORGE ESTABROOK DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

**HON. STEVE ISRAEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 28, 2001*

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to rise today to offer my sincere congratulations to the six alumni recipients of the 2001 George M. Estabrook Distinguished Service Award. These six individuals are receiving Hofstra University's most prestigious alumni award for all of their excellence in the categories of career and service to society.

Thomas J. McAteer, Honorable John Pessala, Edward P. Mangano, Mindy Dragovich, Lauren Hanley and Steven B. Aptheker all represent an extremely impressive group and truly deserve their award tonight, December 1, 2001 at the Hofstra Annual Alumni Award Dinner.

Congratulations again to this fine and outstanding group of candidates.

SAVE-A-FRIEND NATIONAL  
HOTLINE PROGRAM

**HON. MARK FOLEY**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 28, 2001*

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today concerning the Save-A-Friend national hotline program. The need for a national school violence hotline to help prevent tragedies in our nation's schools is extremely pressing. These senseless acts of violence against children must be stopped. While hotlines at the state and local level are useful, a national hotline must be implemented in order to better combat the problem of school violence.

I am pleased that the concept of Save-A-Friend has been supported by so many and I plan on making a request to the United States Department of Justice recommending a total of \$500,000 in grant funding for the study and preliminary design of a Save-A-Friend National Hotline Program. This hotline should be staffed by trained professionals, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and ensure timely interaction between schools, local police organizations, the FBI and other federal law enforcement agencies. My request will ask the Department of Justice to report back its plan and budget to implement such a program on a national basis next year. This report will be submitted before the Fiscal Year 2003 budget process.

TRIBUTE TO THE HILL VIEW TREE  
FARM

**HON. BILL SHUSTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 28, 2001*

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share some exciting news from my district. I

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

am delighted to report that the official White House Christmas tree is coming from a farm in my district. Specifically, the White House Christmas tree has been chosen from the Hill View Tree Farm in Middlecreek, PA, which is owned and operated by Janice Bowersox and her son and daughter-in-law, Darryl and Aimee Bowersox.

In order to achieve the honor of being designated the farm to supply the White House Christmas trees, the Bowersox family entered the national Christmas Tree contest, an event sponsored by the National Christmas Tree Association. The Bowersox family won the contest at the national convention in August 2000, where they were named Grand Champions. As the winner, Hill View Tree Farm became the chosen supplier of two Christmas trees for the White House.

One tree will be set up in the Yellow Oval Room to serve as the tree for the Bush family. This is the tree under which members of the first family are likely to put their presents. This tree, from the Hill View Farm, is about 8 feet tall and has been growing in the field since 1989. The larger tree, which will be placed in the Blue Room, must be at least 18½ feet high. This larger tree will be the official White House Christmas tree. It is being supplied for Hill View Farm by Donald Craul of Lewisburg, Pennsylvania.

The two trees will be cut and delivered to the White House the week after Thanksgiving. Janice, Darryl and Aimee Bowersox will present the official White House Christmas tree to first lady Laura Bush at the White House on the morning of November 28.

Hill View Tree Farm was founded in 1954. The farm has about 150,000 Christmas trees growing on 120 acres. The Bowersox family grows Douglas fir, Colorado spruce, white pine, and concolor fir trees. According to Janice Bowersox, winning the White House Christmas tree contest has long been a family goal. Janice Bowersox said she and her family are honored to be presenting this year's tree and thrilled to have received the top honor in the Christmas tree industry.

I am delighted that a farm from my district was chosen to be a part of the White House Christmas tree tradition. I am happy for the Bowersox family, and I hope that the Christmas tree chosen for the White House will bring joy to the President and Mrs. Bush and their family.

THE TRANSPORTED AIR POLLUTION  
MITIGATION ACT OF 2001

**HON. GARY A. CONDIT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 28, 2001*

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce "The Transported Air Pollution Mitigation Act of 2001." This bill holds upwind air districts responsible to neighboring downwind air districts for the impacts of transported air pollution.

The Clean Air Act requires States to address the impact of air pollution that is transported between States. It is silent, however, about addressing transported air pollution within a State or what mitigation measures are

imposed when transported pollution occurs between States. This oversight allows upwind air districts—because of prevailing wind patterns—to transport locally generated emissions to neighboring downwind air districts and only requires them to address the emissions that remain in the upwind district.

Transported pollution impacts the environment, public health, and economies in the downwind air districts. Pollution knows no political boundaries. A case in point is the San Francisco Bay Area. The California Air Resources Board has classified the San Francisco Bay Area as an "overwhelming" ozone contributor to each of the four neighboring air districts surrounding it—Sacramento, the San Joaquin Valley, Southern Sonoma, and the Monterey Bay-Central Coast region. This classification means that air quality monitoring data has shown there are days in which the downwind air district is in violation of quality standards because of emissions generated by the upwind air district.

This bill is a matter of fairness and equity. It requires those areas that are responsible to be accountable for the public health, environmental and economic impacts to their downwind neighbors.

CLEAN DIAMOND TRADE ACT

SPEECH OF

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 27, 2001*

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the "Clean Diamond Trade Act," and, additionally, to express my support for those diamond-producing nations like Botswana that have served as a positive example during the development of this important legislation.

The move to prevent so-called conflict diamonds from reaching U.S. markets has never been so important. Illegal diamond smuggling has helped prolong conflicts in which millions have been displaced, and millions more have been killed in brutal conflicts that have ravaged sub-Saharan Africa. Additionally, recent reports in the Washington Post by editor Steve Coll and other news services that rebel warlords in nations such as Sierra Leone are mining diamonds for sale to the al Qaeda terrorist network have highlighted the need for this important legislation. Thus, efforts restricting this source of funding to blood-thirsty factions that are running roughshod over the inalienable human rights due to the citizens of these war-torn nations are both highly commendable and exceedingly necessary. They serve to protect the lives of innocent African civilians, cut the funding sources of terrorist organizations, and thereby serve to protect the lives of innocent Americans.

My only concern is that in this drive to cut war-mongering factions off from the funding that sustains them, Congress ensures that law-abiding nations whose diamond industries support stable democracies not be a casualty of this very important and honorable piece of legislation.

In April, some of my colleagues and I had the opportunity to visit Botswana, a country

23303

whose growing economy is inextricably linked to its legitimate diamond mining industry. During my visit, we met American ambassador John Lange, His Excellency President Festus Mogae, and Health Minister Joy Phumanbi, along with many other dignitaries and government officials. We toured the Jwaneng Mine and the Princess Marina Hospital. These meetings made a strong impression on me, particularly the tour of the hospital. It was a clear indication of the strides that Botswana has been able to make in its fight against AIDS and HIV infection through the revenue generated by its diamond industry.

In these times of conflict and the proliferation of the AIDS pandemic that is devastating many sub-Saharan African Nations, Botswana stands out as an example of democracy in action. Its diamond industry and sound financial management has made Botswana's economy one of the fastest growing in the world. Botswana's successful development of its diamond industry has translated into the resources needed to bolster its democracy and fight the scourge of AIDS that is spreading so rapidly throughout the region.

As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, these issues are of particular importance to me. The CBC has long focused on stabilizing the region and increasing economic growth and trade opportunities for sub-Saharan Africa. The protective language in section 4 of H.R. 2722 is vitally important to achieving those ends. It establishes a framework under which diamonds from legitimate, law-abiding governments are separated from those originating in conflict zones. The legislation allows the president to import diamonds only from those countries that take effective measures to stop trade in conflict diamonds.

Under the act, effective measures are defined as those that either (1) comply with the requirements of U.N. Security Council Resolutions on conflict diamonds, (2) meet the requirements of an international arrangement on conflict diamonds (provided that arrangement comports with Security Council Resolutions), or (3) contain certain "minimum standards" (e.g., the country requires that all rough diamond exports are packaged securely with officially validated documentation certifying country of origin, total carat weight, and value). Under this new framework, the Administration would have the authority to bar rough diamond imports from any country that does not have an effective system of rough diamond controls.

This is imperative because it allows those who are lawfully engaged in building stable industries to support their economies to continue to grow and provide for the welfare of their citizens. To penalize countries who are legitimately mining diamonds to build vital infrastructure that provides better services and more opportunities to its citizens in order to punish those who would smuggle diamonds to achieve more sinister aims throws the baby out with the bath water. Any legislation dealing with the diamond trade must make a distinction between the two. Indeed, by drawing this bright line, Congress will not only cut funding to war criminals. Congress will have succeeded in supporting and bolstering trade opportunities with countries that can be held up as examples of success in this troubled region.

This body will be well apprised of further successes. The bill requires that the President submit to Congress regular reports identifying countries involved in conflict diamond trade and describing actions taken by the United States and other countries to stop trade in conflict diamonds. Additionally, the bill specifies that the GAO transmit a report on the effectiveness of the Act within three years of its effective date.

I commend Congress for addressing this very critical issue in such a responsible and effective manner. It is consistent with other Congressional initiatives to combat the AIDS pandemic and seek resolution to the numerous conflicts in the area. By singling out the export of so-called "blood diamonds" for sanction, this act will enhance the ability of legitimate diamond industries in the area to flourish, providing a much needed foundation on which economic and political stability can be built.

SIKHS MUST HAVE A FREE  
KHALISTAN, ALL OTHER RELI-  
GIOUS GROUPS HAVE THEIR OWN  
COUNTRIES, SIKHS ARE SEPA-  
RATE RELIGION, CULTURE, LAN-  
GUAGE, AND PEOPLE

### HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 2001

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, all over the world, religious and ethnic groups have their own countries. There are numerous countries dominated by Christians and as we have recently been reminded, there are numerous Muslim countries as well. The Hindus rule India and a few other countries. There are a number of Buddhist countries. The Jewish people have Israel. Only the Sikhs do not have their own country.

Sikhs declared their independence from India on October 7, 1987, naming their country Khalistan. Unfortunately, Khalistan continues to live under a brutal occupation by India that has cost a quarter of a million Sikhs their lives since 1984. Earlier this year, the Movement Against State Repression issued a report showing that India is holding at least 52,268 Sikh political prisoners, by their own admission, in illegal detention without charge or trial. Some of them have been held since 1984. Former Member of Parliament Atinder Pal Singh noted that "there is no family in the 12,687 villages of Punjab of which one or the other Sikh member has not been killed by the police."

As I have previously said, "The mere fact that they have the right to choose their oppressors does not mean they live in a democracy." My colleague, the gentleman from California, Mr. Rohrabacher, has said that for Sikhs and Kashmiris, "India might as well be Nazi Germany." I cannot make a better statement of how brutal India's occupation of the Sikh homeland is. A new Indian law makes any act a "terrorist offense" to "threaten the unity or integrity of India." Under this law, anyone who peacefully advocates independence for Khalistan or any of the minority nations

such as predominantly Christian Nagaland, Kashmir, or any other can be held as a "terrorist" for as long as it suits the Indian government to do so. This is not democracy, Mr. Speaker.

When India got its independence from Britain, Sikhs were one of the three nations that were to receive their own sovereign state. Muslims got Pakistan, Hindus got India. Sikh leaders stayed with India because Mr. Nehru and Mr. Gandhi promised them that they would enjoy "the glow of freedom" in Punjab and no law would pass affecting Sikhs without their consent. However, as soon as the ink was dry on the agreement for Indian independence, the Indian government put out a memo describing Sikhs as "a criminal class" and began the tyrannical harassment of the Sikhs. Accordingly, no Sikh representative has ever signed the constitution of India.

Sikhs ruled Punjab as an independent country from 1765 to 1849, when the British conquered the subcontinent. Punjab was recognized by most of the major countries at that time. Under Sikh rule, Punjab was a secular state in which Sikhs, Muslims, Hindus, and Christians all had a part in the government. The people prospered.

In June 1984, the Indian government attacked the Sikh religion's most sacred shrine, the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the Vatican or Mecca of the Sikhs. Sant Jarnail Singh Bhindranwale, a leader of the Sikh freedom movement had warned that "If the Indian government attacks the Golden Temple, it will lay the foundation of Khalistan." After the Golden Temple attack, the movement for an independent Sikh country, Khalistan, took on steam. As a result, India stepped up the repression. In the words of Narinder Singh, a spokesman for the Golden Temple who appeared on NPR in August 1997, "The Indian government, all the time they boast that they're democratic, they're secular, but they have nothing to do with a democracy, they have nothing to do with a secularism. They try to crush Sikhs just to please the majority."

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. I must join Atinder Pal Singh, the former Member of Parliament in asking, "why can't the Khalistan, Sikhistan, or whatever name you might like to give it be formed for the Sikhs?"

India claims to be "the world's largest democracy." If that is so, then why can't India do the democratic thing and let the people of Khalistan and the peoples of all the minority nations have a free and fair plebiscite, with international monitoring, to decide the question of independence? Isn't that the democratic way? The United States does it for Puerto Rico, Canada does it for Quebec. Why can't "the world's largest democracy" do it for the people of Khalistan, Kashmir, Christian Nagaland, and all the other minority nations? Only when these nations are free will the repression of minorities in India end.

The U.S. Congress should go on record in support of self-determination for all the people of South Asia and we should stop American aid to India until the repression ends. The only answer is freedom. Let's do what we can to support it and expand it.